

Lobbyists give 92 percent of their money in hard contributions. They say oh, this limit is too low, \$1,000. Yes, less than 1 percent of the people in America contribute \$1,000, so for 99 percent of the people, this a moot argument. Yes, but for those fat cats, those people who can afford the \$1,000, this is an argument.

Come on, guys, let us get real. You say oh, the Senate, the Senate is doing \$2,000; \$2,000 every 6 years. You are talking about \$2,000 every 2 years. That means every 6-year Senate cycle they raise \$2,000, you raise \$6,000.

So the arguments that are being drug before us are false arguments. Many reformers back in 1974 argued for \$100. Apply the inflation rate to \$100. It would be far less than the \$1,000 of today. True reform, get the money out, stick with the lower limits.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, if this important bipartisan Shays-Meehan proposal has any defect, it is that it does too little, not too much, as its detractors have claimed tonight.

With the Shays-Meehan proposal, we take a very important step to reform, but it certainly is not the last step that we need to take. Only one-ninth of 1 percent of Americans gave \$1,000 to a federal candidate during the last election cycle. The sole purpose of this amendment is to allow that elite group to give even more.

If we succeed in banning soft money on the one hand, but we increase the amount of hard money on the other hand, we will have simply taken from one and given to another. We have merely traded Tweedle-Dee for Tweedle-Dum.

The purported inequity that this amendment allegedly corrects is that candidates for the Senate can receive \$2,000 during a 6 year term. But without this amendment, Members of the House can already receive \$1,000 every 2 years or \$3,000 during the same 6 year period. There is no inequity to correct.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be rejected.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Oregon who said that hard money in the last election was outraised 3.2 to 1, incumbents to challengers, ask him what the ratio is of PAC money incumbents to challengers. It is a lot higher, because PACs do not give to challengers, and at least they can get individual contributions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, 3 years ago I was against raising the amount we could have in our coffers for running for Congress. At that time the two Democratic and Republican chairmen came to the Committee on Rules and they said,

well, we need \$3,500. I thought that was too much.

I have changed my mind. We have had inflation and we need to index it, and we ought to move from \$1,000 to \$2,000.

Those of us, and there are a number of them here in the Chamber, that do not take political action committee money, who can give \$5,000 to a candidate, the way those of the rest of us look to our constituency and our friends and the people that elected us, and those are the ones that want to back us, we do not have to then be with the interests that too often are in Washington and even in our States. So I hope we would move from \$1,000 to \$2,000.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose this amendment which doubles the amount of money an individual can donate to a candidate, known as hard money, from \$1,000 to \$2,000. This amendment really is a complete step backwards in trying to get money out of our political system.

As Public Campaign states in its report called "The Color of Money," it is an indisputable fact of our political system that those candidates and laws favored by wealthy contributors usually prevail over those would-be backers who cannot afford to give such large sums of money.

Now, because of wage disparities and lower incomes in minority and poor communities, these constituencies just do not have large amounts of money to contribute to campaigns. We only further disenfranchise them if we raise the amount of hard money that an individual can contribute.

Also this hard-money system makes it much harder for women, people of color, and low-income people to run for office. It is really undemocratic. Allowing that amount to be doubled will only give wealthy people even more influence in our political system.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this very discriminatory amendment. We should be reducing the hard-money limits, rather than increasing them.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from Tennessee and believe that he is not bringing this amendment for any ill purposes and may genuinely believe that he is doing a good thing here. But I think logic, if we can talk for a second, argues otherwise.

The fact of the matter is, as others have mentioned here, the underlying bill is trying to get money out of politics. We take target on the soft money and move that along.

The fact of the matter, it seems incongruous and contradictory to take a

look and say now, on the hard money, we are going to increase the amount on that. If you can get access, if you can play in this political game at \$1,000, you can certainly play at \$2,000. For those in our American system who have not been able to play at the \$1,000 level, you will be even further excluded and feel even more remote from the process.

There are already too many people participating in this system, too few people registering and too few a percentage of those registered people voting; and a great part of it is because they think people that have money in the system have access. And that does not matter whether it is soft money or hard money. If you double the hard-money limits, then people that do not have \$1,000 to throw in a pie and do not have \$2,000 think you are just making it more and more difficult for them to have a voice.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Wamp amendment. Putting more big money into the system is not the solution. We should be trying to encourage candidates to raise dollars in smaller amounts, not increasing the contribution amount to \$2,000.

This debate reminds me of the discussion between the candidate and the contributor. The contributor asked the candidate, what do I get if I contribute \$500 to your campaign? The candidate says, you get good government.

The contributor says, well, what do I get if I contribute \$1,000 to your campaign? The candidate says, you get good government.

Well, how about \$2,000? The answer is, you get any kind of government you want.

We do not want to go down that road. Keep the \$1,000 maximum contribution limit. Vote no on the Wamp amendment.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. To limit the availability of soft money while simultaneously raising individual contribution levels will not be seen as campaign finance reform by our constituents.

□ 2145

It will simply look like the old bait and switch, like the old Washington where one hand washes the other, where lots of dollars flow to officeholders, and where the public interest is not the first priority in lawmaking.

Senator Ev Dirksen once joked, a billion here, a billion there, and pretty soon you are talking about some real money. Well, Mr. Chairman, to many of our constituents, \$1,000 might as well be \$1 billion, and a thousand here and a